



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/095,325	06/10/1998	GENE EGGLESTON	214149US25DIV	9524
22850 7590 04/23/2007 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER WINDER, PATRICE L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2145	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/23/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 04/23/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/095,325

Applicant(s)

EGGLESTON ET AL.

Examiner

Patrice Winder

Art Unit

2145

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 November 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 33-68 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 33-68 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 56-63 and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Pepe et al., USPN 5,742,668 (hereafter referred to as Pepe).
3. Regarding claim 56, Pepe taught a computer system for forwarding messaged from a mobile client (abstract) comprising:

a host system capable of sending and receiving messages, wherein a message sender's email address is associated with host system (column 5, lines 7-13; column 18, lines 1-16);

a forwarding component operable with the host system that upon receiving a message generated at the mobile client, by a message sender destined for a message recipient (column 18, lines 16-20), configures the received message, prior to forwarding to the message recipient, such that the received message appears to the message recipient as if the received message originated at the sender's email address associated with the host system (conversion of source addresses at PCI, column 24,

lines 27-31), thereby allowing messages generated at either the mobile client or host system to originate at the sender's email address associated with the host system (messages generated by mobile client are routed at PCI server and PCI generates converted messages at PCI, column 24, lines 27-31).

4. Regarding dependent claim 57, Pepe taught an email address field in the configured received messages is the message sender's email address associated with the host system (column 23, lines 40-46).

5. Regarding dependent claim 58, Pepe taught a reply-to email address field in the configured received message is the message sender's email address associated with the host system (part of text message format, column 23, lines 28-29).

6. Regarding dependent claim 59, Pepe taught a computer system further comprising a code added to the configured received message to make an indication to the message recipient (column 24, lines 37-50).

7. The language of claims 60-63, 65 is substantially the same as previously rejected claims 56-59, above. Therefore, claims 60-63, 65 are rejected on the same rationale as previously rejected claims 56-59, above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

10. Claims 33-34, 40-47, 54-55 and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shirakihara et al., USPN 5,941,956 (hereafter referred to as Shirakihara) in Perkins, USPN 5,159,592 (hereafter referred to as Perkins).

11. Claims 35-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shirakihara and Perkins as applied to claim 34 above, and further in view of Dunn.

12. Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shirakihara and Perkins as applied to claim 33, above, and further in view of Pepe.

13. Claims 48-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shirakihara as applied to claim 33 above, and further in view of Pepe.

14. Claims 66-68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pepe in view of Dunn.

15. Regarding claim 33, Shirakihara taught a method of forwarding messages between a host system and a mobile client (abstract), comprising the steps of:

establishing a session based on loaded parameters at the host system (column 8, lines 3-13);

querying the host system (column 8, lines 3-13);

receiving messages directed to a first address at the host system from a plurality of message senders (column 7, lines 34-41; column 8, lines 14-18);

in response to a query, continuously forwarding the messages from the host system to the mobile client (column 8, lines 21-44);

generating reply messages at the mobile client to be sent to the plurality of message senders and transmitting the reply messages to the host system (column 8, lines 48-53);

receiving the reply messages at the host system and configuring the reply messages such that it will appear to the plurality of message senders that the reply messages originated at the first address associated with the host system (Response message $M(A1, a2)$ sent to conversion device 3-2 and becomes $M(A1, A2)$. Response message $M(A1, A2)$ sent to conversion device 3-1 and becomes $M(a1, A2)$.); and

transmitting the reply messages from the host system to the plurality of message senders (column 8, lines 48-53). Shirakihara does not specifically teach maintaining the session at host system. However, Perkins taught maintaining the session at the host system (column 3, lines 63-68; column 6, lines 1-7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that incorporating Perkins's step of maintaining the session in Shirakihara's method for forwarding messages would

Art Unit: 2145

have would have improved reliability. The motivation would have been to ensure packets are routed to migrating mobile clients (Perkins, column 2, lines 65-66).

16. Regarding dependent claim 34, Shirakihara taught the method further comprising the step of: storing information regarding the configuration of the mobile client at the host system (column 8, lines 7-13).

17. Regarding dependent claim 35, Shirakihara taught the configuration information stored at the stored at the host includes (A) the network address of the mobile client (column 8, lines 7-13). Shirakihara does not specifically teach the host include (B) an indication of the types of the message attachments that the mobile client will receive and process. However, Dunn taught a host includes (B) an indication of the types of the message attachments that the mobile client will receive and process (column 15, lines 17-23; column 19, lines 27-32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that incorporating Dunn's message type in Shirakihara-Perkins method of forwarding messages would have improved system robustness. The motivation would have been to route messages to roaming target users without the message senders needing to have detailed information about the mobile client (Dunn, column 1, lines 9-16).

18. Regarding dependent claim 36, Dunn taught the configuration information further includes: (C) an indication of the protocol of the mobile client (column 22, lines 46-59).

19. Regarding dependent claim 37, Shirakihara-Perkins does not specifically teach whether the messages include an attachment. However, Dunn taught a method for forwarding messages further comprising the steps of:

Art Unit: 2145

for each message to be forwarded, the host system determining whether the message includes an attachment, and if so then determining the type of attachment (column 23, lines 40-42);

accessing the stored configuration information at the host system to determine whether the mobile client will receive and process attachments of the determined type (column 23, lines 40-47); and

if so, then forwarding the attachments to the mobile client (column 30, lines 40-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that incorporating Dunn's message type in Shirakihara-Perkins method of forwarding messages would have expanded system flexibility by including more message types. The motivation would have been to route messages to roaming target users without the message senders needing to have detailed information about the mobile client (Dunn, column 1, lines 9-16).

20. Regarding dependent claim 38, Dunn taught the type of attachment is a sound file (column 15, lines 15-17).

21. Regarding dependent claim 39, Shirakihara taught the received messages are addressed using a sender address and a receiver address (column 7, lines 53-57), the method further comprising the steps of:

determining whether the receiver address is associated with the mobile client (column 8, lines 14-29);

if the receiver address is associated with the mobile client, then determining a network address of the mobile client and packetizing the messages using the receiver address and the network address of the mobile client (column 8, lines 14-29); and

after receiving the forwarded messages at the wireless subscriber unit, so that it appears as though the mobile client is the host system (column 8, lines 45-53).

Shirakihara-Perkins does not specifically teach displaying the messages at the mobile client using the sender address and the receiver address. However, Pepe taught displaying the messages at the mobile client using the sender address and the receiver address (column 18, lines 1-6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that incorporating Pepe's displaying messages in Shirakihara-Perkins' system for forwarding messages would have provided an equivalent mechanism for viewing messages. The motivation would have been to allow the receiver to access forwarded messages.

22. Regarding dependent claim 40, Shirakihara taught the parameters of the established session at the host system include external events (column 8, lines 3-13) or internal events (column 8, lines 8-13). Perkins taught the parameters of the established session at the host system include network events (column 6, lines 8-18).

23. Regarding dependent claim 41, Shirakihara taught the external event is a registration message from the mobile client (column 8, lines 3-13).

24. Regarding dependent claim 42, Shirakihara taught the internal event is an execution of control messages (execution of response registration messages, column 8, lines 3-13).

25. Regarding dependent claim 43, Shirakihara the internal event is an execution of programs (programs to respond to registration, column 8, lines 3-13).
26. Regarding dependent claim 44, Perkins taught the internal event is a timer operation (column 5, lines 34-42).
27. Regarding dependent claim 45, Perkins taught the networked events include messages to begin forwarding from computer systems other than the mobile client, which are connected to the host system via wired network (column 6, lines 8-18).
28. Regarding dependent claim 46, Shirakihara taught the mobile client is a mobile station (column 7, lines 34-41).
29. Regarding dependent claim 47, Dunn taught the mobile client is a device equipped to receive both voice and non-voice data messages (column 15, lines 17-23).
30. Regarding dependent claim 48, Shirakihara-Perkins does not specifically teach the host system includes a client profile database limiting the forwarding step to forwarding only those messages that are transmitted to the host system from a sender stored in the database. However, Pepe taught a host system includes a client profile database limiting the forwarding step to forwarding only those messages that are transmitted to the host system from a sender stored in the database (column 5, lines 45-54; column 6, lines 48-59). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that incorporating Pepe's client profile database in Shirakihara-Perkins' system for forwarding messages to mobile clients would have improved system robustness. The motivation would have been to reduce the consumption of system resources by not sending unwanted messages.

Art Unit: 2145

31. Regarding dependent claim 49, Pepe taught a user can add and subtract senders from the database (column 27, lines 9-12).

32. Regarding dependent claim 50, Pepe taught a user can add and subtract senders from the database by configuring the host system (column 27, lines 15-24).

33. Regarding dependent claim 51, Pepe taught a user can add and subtract senders from the database by transmitting a command message from the mobile client to the host system (column 27, lines 15-24).

34. Regarding dependent claim 52, Pepe taught an active client profile database is activated and deactivated at the host (column 6, lines 47-59; column 26, lines 43-47).

35. Regarding dependent claim 53, Pepe taught an active client profile database is activated and deactivated from the mobile client (column 26, lines 43-47).

36. The language of claims 54-55, 64 is substantially the same as previously rejected claim 33, above. Therefore, claims 54-55, 64 are rejected on the same rationale as previously rejected claim 33, above.

37. Regarding dependent claim 66, Pepe does not specifically teach maintaining the session. However, Dunn taught a method of forwarding message comprising the steps of:

establishing a session with the host system based on loaded parameters (column 9, lines 51-55);

maintaining the session with the host system and querying the host system (column 9, lines 46-51);

continuously forwarding the received messages from the host system to the wireless mobile client associated with the host system (column 17, lines 46-61). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made Dunn's maintaining a session in Pepe's system for forwarding messages would improved system robustness. The motivation would have been to reduce the number of messages are lost to being out of range.

38. Regarding dependent claim 67, Pepe taught the session is an execution of programs (column 16, lines 1-11).

39. Regarding dependent claim 68, Pepe taught a method further comprising the steps of:

loading parameters at the host system (column 16, lines 1-11);

filtering received messages at the host system using one or more message filter prior to forwarding messages to the wireless mobile client (column 10, lines 33-43).

Response to Arguments

40. Applicant's arguments filed November 17, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

41. Applicant argues – "Pepe does not disclose how the header of the notification message is configured. That is, there is not teaching or suggestion that the email header reflects that the message originated at a first address associated with a host system "

Art Unit: 2145

- a. Pepe discloses that the PCI server generates converted messages with translated source addresses. Pepe also discloses that a mobile client generates messages that are routed to the PCI server. The PCI server then generates converted messages of the messages received from the mobile clients.

Response to Amendment

42. The affidavit filed on November 17, 2006 under 37 CFR 1.131 has been considered but is ineffective to overcome the Skirakihara reference.

43. The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish a conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the Shirakihara reference. While conception is the mental part of the inventive act, it must be capable of proof, such as by demonstrative evidence or by a complete disclosure to another. Conception is more than a vague idea of how to solve a problem. The requisite means themselves and their interaction must also be comprehended. See *Mergenthaler v. Scudder*, 1897 C.D. 724, 81 O.G. 1417 (D.C. Cir. 1897).

44. In item (3), co-inventor Gene Eggleston indicates that he was employed as of December 1995. However, the critical date of the Shirakihara reference is June 7, 1995 which is after the indicated date of employment.

- b. A general allegation that the invention was completed prior to the date of the reference is not sufficient. Ex parte Saunders, 1883 C.D. 23, 23 O.G. 1224 (Comm'r Pat. 1883). Similarly, a declaration by the inventor to the effect that his

or her invention was conceived or reduced to practice prior to the reference date, without a statement of facts demonstrating the correctness of this conclusion, is insufficient to satisfy 37 CFR 1.131. 37 CFR 1.131(b) requires that original exhibits of drawings or records, or photocopies thereof, accompany and form part of the affidavit or declaration or their absence satisfactorily explained. In *Ex parte Donovan*, 1890 C.D. 109, 52 O.G. 309 (Comm'r Pat. 1890) the court stated if the applicant made sketches he should so state, and produce and describe them; if the sketches were made and lost, and their contents remembered, they should be reproduced and furnished in place of the originals. The same course should be pursued if the disclosure was by means of models. If neither sketches nor models are relied upon, but it is claimed that verbal disclosures, sufficiently clear to indicate definite conception of the invention, were made the witness should state as nearly as possible the language used in imparting knowledge of the invention to others.

45. In item (4), co-inventor Eggleston states that claims 33, 54-56, 60 and 64-65 have a "transparency feature" and provides claim 33 as an example. However, the phrase "transparency" is not recited in the selected claims. Therefore, Applicant is making a general allegation that the invention was completed prior to date of the reference.

c. Applicant must give a clear explanation of the exhibits pointing out exactly what facts are established and relied on by applicant. 505 F.2d at 718-19, 184 USPQ at 33. See also *In re Harry*, 333 F.2d 920, 142 USPQ 164 (CCPA 1964)

(Affidavit "asserts that facts exist but does not tell what they are or when they occurred."). Conception has been defined as "the complete performance of the mental part of the inventive act" and it is "the formation in the mind of the inventor of a definite and permanent idea of the complete and operative invention as it is thereafter to be applied in practice...." *Townsend v. Smith*, 36 F.2d 292, 295, 4 USPQ 269, 271 (CCPA 1930). "[C]onception is established when the invention is made sufficiently clear to enable one skilled in the art to reduce it to practice without the exercise of extensive experimentation or the exercise of inventive skill." *Hiatt v. Ziegler*, 179 USPQ 757, 763 (Bd. Pat. Inter. 1973).

46. In item (5), co-inventor Eggleston alludes to "conception" prior to the critical date of June 7, 1995 as evidenced by item (6). However, exhibits A-C don't correlate to the claimed subject matter and also don't refer to a "transparency feature".

d. Conception has also been defined as a disclosure of an invention which enables one skilled in the art to reduce the invention to a practical form without "exercise of the inventive faculty." *Gunter v. Stream*, 573 F.2d 77, 197 USPQ 482 (CCPA 1978). See also *Coleman v. Dines*, 754 F.2d 353, 224 USPQ 857 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (It is settled that in establishing conception a party must show possession of every feature recited in the count, and that every limitation of the count must have been known to the inventor at the time of the alleged conception. Conception must be proved by corroborating evidence.); *Hybritech Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies Inc.*, 802 F. 2d 1367, 1376, 231 USPQ 81, 87 (Fed. Cir. 1986) (Conception is the "formation in the mind of the inventor, of a definite

and permanent idea of the complete and operative invention, as it is hereafter to be applied in practice.") *Hitzeman v. Rutter*, 243 F.3d 1345, 58 USPQ2d 1161 (Fed. Cir. 2001).

47. In item (6), co-inventor Eggleston alludes to "reduction to practice" at a tradeshow prior to the critical date of June 7, 1995. However, the exhibits provided don't clearly correlate to Applicant's claim language, i.e. Applicant's claim doesn't use the language "transparency". None of the exhibits relate to what was prevented by co-inventor Eggleston at the tradeshow.

e. The affidavit or declaration and exhibits must clearly explain which facts or data applicant is relying on to show completion of his or her invention prior to the particular date. Vague and general statements in broad terms about what the exhibits describe along with a general assertion that the exhibits describe a reduction to practice "amounts essentially to mere pleading, unsupported by proof or a showing of facts" and, thus, does not satisfy the requirements of 37 CFR 1.131(b). *In re Borkowski*, 505 F.2d 713, 184 USPQ 29 (CCPA 1974).

48. Applicant fails provide evidence to show diligence between the conception in item (5) and the reduction to practice of item (6).

f. An applicant must account for the entire period during which diligence is required. *Gould v. Schawlow*, 363 F.2d 908, 919, 150 USPQ 634, 643 (CCPA 1966) (Merely stating that there were no weeks or months that the invention was not worked on is not enough.); *In re Harry*, 333 F.2d 920, 923, 142 USPQ 164, 166 (CCPA 1964) (statement that the subject matter "was diligently reduced to

Art Unit: 2145

practice" is not a showing but a mere pleading). A 2-day period lacking activity has been held to be fatal. *In re Mulder*, 716 F.2d 1542, 1545, 219 USPQ 189, 193 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (37 CFR 1.131 issue); *Fitzgerald v. Arbib*, 268 F.2d 763, 766, 122 USPQ 530, 532 (CCPA 1959) (Less than 1 month of inactivity during critical period. Efforts to exploit an invention commercially do not constitute diligence in reducing it to practice. An actual reduction to practice in the case of a design for a three-dimensional article requires that it should be embodied in some structure other than a mere drawing.); *Kendall v. Searles*, 173 F.2d 986, 993, 81 USPQ 363, 369 (CCPA 1949) (Diligence requires that applicants must be specific as to dates and facts.)

g. The diligence of attorney in preparing and filing patent application inures to the benefit of the inventor. Conception was established at least as early as the date a draft of a patent application was finished by a patent attorney on behalf of the inventor. Conception is less a matter of signature than it is one of disclosure. Attorney does not prepare a patent application on behalf of particular named persons, but on behalf of the true inventive entity. Six days to execute and file application is acceptable. *Haskell v. Coleburne*, 671 F.2d 1362, 213 USPQ 192, 195 (CCPA 1982). See also *Bey v. Kollonitsch*, 866 F.2d 1024, 231 USPQ 967 (Fed. Cir. 1986)

49. The affidavit is not made on behalf of all inventors of the claimed subject matter. And there is no showing that co-inventor Eggleston is the sole inventor of the claims under rejection. Therefore, the affidavit fails to comply with MPEP 715.04.

Conclusion

50. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

51. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrice Winder whose telephone number is 571-272-3935. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 10:30 am-7:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on 571-272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Patrice Winder
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2145

April 17, 1997